

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-10, 12-15, and 17-18 were pending in this application. Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claim amendments

Claims 1, 10, and 15 have been amended to merely clarify the recited limitations. Specifically, claims 1, 10, and 15 have been amended to recite a temporary call list “for analysis,” analyzing each of the incoming calls “in the temporary call list,” and a permanent call list for moving the “analyzed incoming calls.” No new matter has been added by way of this amendment, as support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, in paragraphs [0015]-[0020].

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 10, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,840 (hereinafter “Corrigan”) in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP409200319A (hereinafter “Tanitsu”), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,197,062 (hereinafter “Picklesimer”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

a. Corrigan does not disclose placing the incoming calls in a temporary list for analysis.

On page 2 of the Office Action dated July 28, 2008, (hereinafter “the Office Action”) the Examiner alleges that Corrigan discloses this limitation. Specifically, the Office Action states that:

“As to claims 1, 10, and 15, Corrigan et al. teaches the steps of: placing incoming calls in a list/single channel (col. 4, lines 32-43 – *where Corrigan discussed a voice telephone call can be placed in an available single channel 218*);”

Applicants respectfully disagree. Corrigan merely discloses placing telephone calls within TDMA channels, and not in a temporary list for analysis. A TDMA channel is merely a temporal assignment of a carrier frequency to a particular telephone call (see Corrigan FIG. 1, where RF carrier 216 comprises 8 TDMA divisions 218). A TDMA channel or even an *n* number of TDMA channels is merely a portion of the carrier frequency devoted to a particular call or *n* calls. It is in no way equivalent to a temporary call list in which incoming calls that

occur within a time interval less than that required to process an incoming ISDN call are placed for analysis. Therefore, Corrigan fails to teach placing each of the incoming calls in a temporary call list for analysis, as required by the rejected claims.

b. *Corrigan does not disclose a permanent call list in which analyzed incoming calls are placed based on the video channel type of the incoming call.*

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Corrigan discloses moving incoming calls to a permanent call list. Specifically, the Office Action states that:

“...analyzing the incoming calls to determine video channel type and moving the incoming calls to a list/six TDMA channels (col.4, lines 43-56; col. 6, ilnes 36-61).”

Applicants respectfully disagree. The six TDMA channels disclosed by Corrigan are not a list, but an allocation of time, or communication resources, on a RF carrier. For example, Corrigan, in col. 6, ll. 47-53 describes how a voice service may be allotted one TDMA channel, while a video service may be allotted six TDMA channels. In other words, a video conference call, been carried on a particular carrier frequency, may be allotted six time slots on that carrier frequency to accommodate to video conference call’s bandwidth requirement. There is no teaching whatsoever of placing the incoming calls on a list, let alone a permanent list. Furthermore, there is nothing permanent about the allocation of resources taught by Corrigan, because even after a service has been established the resources are allocated dynamically based on the current bandwidth requirement. In addition, the claims specifically require placing the analyzed incoming calls in the permanent call list based on the *video channel type* of the incoming call. However, Corrigan merely teaches allocating communication resources based on bandwidth requirements of the service (voice, video, *etc.*). This allocation is in no way based on the video channel type of the incoming call. Therefore, Corrigan fails to teach a permanent call list in which analyzed incoming calls are placed based on the video channel type of the incoming call, as required by the rejected claims.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Tanitsu and Picklesimer do not teach all of the limitations of these claims or provide that which Corrigan lacks with respect to these claims. Therefore, Corrigan, Tanistu, and Picklesimer whether considered separately or in combination fail to teach all of the limitations of these claims.

c. The Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in combining the cited references.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Tanitsu into the teachings of Corrigan in order to have a more efficient system and responding to simultaneous incoming calls promptly and surely without missing any important incoming calls.”

Applicants respectfully disagree. Tanitsu merely teaches activating LEDs corresponding to each of the received two ISDN calls so that the user can recognize the desired party to speak with first. There is no teaching of *simultaneously* answering the call that the user decided not to answer. Therefore, Tanitsu merely teaches displaying received calls and enabling the user to answer the incoming calls one at a time.

Corrigan on the other hand teaches a method for assigning communication resources in a TDMA communication system according to the bandwidth of the services requested by the subscriber. Even though Corrigan teaches supporting conferencing services, these teachings are limited to resource allocation. There is no teaching in Corrigan for handling simultaneous incoming calls, or for that matter responding to the simultaneous incoming calls such that each of the incoming calls are answered simultaneously. Therefore a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Tanitsu and Corrigan.

Applicants submit that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, one cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references (see MPEP §2143.01). As described above, because there is not objective reason for a person skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Tanitsu and Corrigan, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the present claims are allowable. Dependent claims that have not been discussed are either dependent from the above discussed independent claims, or have been previously allowed. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

November 26, 2008

Date

/Billy C. Allen III/

Billy C. Allen III

Reg. No. 46,147

**WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.**
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070

832/446-2400
832/446-2424 (facsimile)
wcpatent@counselip.com